



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/788,485	03/01/2004	Akihisa Shouen	826.1933	7539
21171	7590	03/22/2006		
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			EXAMINER SINGH, DALIP K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2628	

DATE MAILED: 03/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/788,485

Applicant(s)

SHOUEEN, AKIHISA

Examiner

Dalip K. Singh

Art Unit

2671

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 December 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This Office Action is in response to applicant's amendment dated December 27, 2005 in response to PTO Office Action dated July 27, 2005. The amendments to claim(s) 1 and 3-13; the deletion of claim(s) 2 have been noted and entered in the record, and applicant's remarks have been carefully considered resulting in the action as set forth herein below.

2. Applicant's arguments filed December 27, 2005 have been fully considered with respect to claims 1 and 3-13 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection based on US 2005/0132286 A1 to Rohrabough et al.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 3, 6, 7, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,381,343 B1 to Davis et al. as applied to claim 1 above, in view of US 2005/0132286 A1 to Rohrabough et al.

a. Regarding claims 1, 6 and 10, Davis et al. **discloses** an extraction unit (image server 16) (...a physical sample 10 is digitized...is connected to an image server 16 for creating digital image information representing a physical sample...col. 3, lines 20-37) extracting only a display result to be displayed on the display device (10a, Fig. 1) (...software on the image server...allow a digital image 10a to be displayed based upon captured digital information representations sample 10 so that the displayed image and the physical sample appear alike within prescribed tolerances...col. 3, lines 34-37); and a

transmission unit (network 18, Fig. 1) transmitting the display data to the display device (10a)(...once images created or captured, they can be...sent through a network 18 to a host 20...col. 3, lines 26-31). However, Davis et al. **does not disclose** determining a display region with vertical-to-horizontal length ratios and corner coordinate rounding calculations for a designated display. Rohrabough et al. **discloses** solving the problem for display of internet content (designed for desk-top computers) on small screen, low resolution, or different aspect ratio devices, such as cell phones and hand held computers (...By working tightly with a server-side content translator, web content and functionality can be passed seamlessly to the end user...because the resulting file graphics are handled as vectors, the end user can control real time changes in the size of text and graphics as well as what portion of the file is viewable in the display. This “zoom and pan” capability, familiar to CAD and other vector content software users, adds dramatically to the usability of non-standard display sizes...paragraph 39;...Next in a block 166, the vectors and boundary boxes are processed based on the scale and offset, and a bounding box defining the limits of the display content is determined...logically, there are generally two ways to scale and offset the rendered content...Accordingly, during subsequent processing described below, objects falling within the display bounding boxes are rendered by reducing the scaling of the those objects in the virtual display to how the objects will appear on the client device display relative to the virtual display bounding box...paragraph 95;...As shown in Fig. 4G, respective offsets in X and Y...are applied to the starting point of each of the vectors. The vectors are then scaled by a scale factor “SF”...paragraph 96; paragraph 97;...It is further noted that the different scaling factors can be applied to the X and Y axis so as to change the aspect ratio of the display...the present invention enables the aspect ratio of a rendered display image to be adjusted to better fit the aspect ratio of a rendered display image to be adjusted to better fit the

Art Unit: 2671

aspect ratio of the client device...paragraph 102; Fig. 5 and Fig. 6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify the device as taught by Davis et al. with the feature “vector database that helps retain page layout and/or graphics where it is scaled and/or offset” as taught by Rohrabough et al. **because** it results in freeing up valuable memory space on the client side (paragraph 40).

b. Regarding claims 3, 7 and 11, Davis et al. **discloses** wherein said display data is visually recognizable data from the original image data (...it is advantageous to format the digital information...into multiple layers...layer 80b can include “raw” image information that is uncompressed...layer 80c can have a more compressed representation of the physical sample...col. 4, lines 21-67).

5. Claims 4, 5, 8, 9, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,381,343 B1 to Davis et al. as applied to claim 1 above, in view of US 2005/0132286 A1 to Rohrabough et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,246,421 to Omori.

a. Regarding claims 4, 8 and 12, Davis et al. while **discloses** color correct digital image transmission by reducing or eliminating colorcast and other imperfections (col. 3, lines 38-59) but Davis in view of Rohrabough **does not disclose** graphics data namely the digital image being processed and transmitted to be a three-dimensional graphics. Omori **discloses** geometry computing section 4 implementing such processes as coordinate transformation, clipping and the like for polygon rendering data (col. 3, lines 10-51). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify the Davis-Rohrabough combination image server 16 to handle Omori’s three-dimensional graphics image data as well **because** it reduces

Art Unit: 2671

the bandwidth required for transmitting three-dimensional graphics data to a remote location thus reducing costs.

b. Regarding claims 5, 9 and 13, Davis-Rohrbaugh combination **does not disclose** division of the original image data into a plurality of areas, and allowing a plurality of independent process units to process the areas, thereby performing extracting processes in parallel. Omori **discloses** dividing a two-dimensional image coordinate system into areas each composed of a plurality of pixels (NxM pixels in total)(col. 2, lines 4-50) and allocating NxM circuits respectively to the NxM pixels contained in that area, which results in time required for rendering to be shortened. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify the device as taught by Davis-Rohrbaugh combination with the feature “plural rendering circuits for plurality of areas performing extracting processes in parallel” as taught by Omori **because** it would speed up graphics processing.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2671

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Dalip K. Singh** whose telephone number is **(571) 272-7792**. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Friday (10:30AM-6:30PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Ulka Chauhan**, can be reached at **(571) 272-7782**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, please contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). Please note that the new Central Official FAX number for application specific communications with the USPTO is **571-273-8300** (effective July 15, 2005).

Dalip K. Singh
Examiner, Art Unit 2671

dk
March 16, 2006


ULKA CHAUHAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER